

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

CHARLOTTE AHEART,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

SODEXHO MARRIOTT SERVICES,

INCORPORATED,

Defendant-Appellee,

No. 99-1033

and

MARRIOTT MANAGEMENT SERVICES,

INCORPORATED; MARRIOTT

INTERNATIONAL, INCORPORATED,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.

Peter J. Messitte, District Judge.

(CA-97-3685-PJM)

Submitted: January 31, 2000

Decided: February 22, 2000

Before WILKINS and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges,
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Eric Steele, Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Todd J. Horn, Robin B.
Bowerfind, VENABLE, BAETJER & HOWARD, L.L.P., Baltimore,
Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Charlotte D. Aheart appeals from the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of Sodexo Marriott Services, Inc., on her claim for sexual harassment under Title VII and denying her motion to amend her complaint. Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to Aheart, see Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986), we find that the district court properly found that Marriott proved both elements of its affirmative defense to vicarious liability established by Faragher v. City of Boca Raton, 524 U.S. 775 (1998), and Burlington Indus., Inc. v. Ellereth, 524 U.S. 742 (1998). Aheart also appeals from the denial of her motion to amend her complaint to add a claim under the Montgomery County Human Relations Act. In light of the dismissal of Aheart's federal claim, we find no abuse of discretion in the district court's denial of her motion to amend. See Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962).

Therefore, we affirm the order awarding summary judgment to Marriott and denying Aheart's motion to amend her complaint. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED